

1
2
3
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
5 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

6
7 FELICIA HAYES,

8 Plaintiff(s),

9 v.

10 CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT,

11 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:22-cv-02167-MMD-NJK

ORDER

12 Pending before the Court is an order to show cause. Docket No. 34. Counsel filed a joint
13 response. Docket No. 35.

14 The Court set a firm discovery cutoff of November 1, 2023. Docket No. 31. On November
15 15, 2023, the parties sought to modify the case management deadline for filing dispositive motions
16 on the ground that “the parties conducted additional discovery after the close of discovery.”
17 Docket No. 32 at 2. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure expressly disallow parties from agreeing
18 to engage in discovery in contradiction to the scheduling order without obtaining judicial approval.
19 Fed. R. Civ. P. 29(b). Well-established Ninth Circuit law also makes abundantly clear that
20 scheduling orders are important and must be taken seriously. Docket No. 34 at 2-3 (collecting
21 cases).¹ The rule and the case law clearly contradict the surprising view now expressed that
22 scheduling orders need not be followed. *See* Docket No. 35 at 10 (explaining belief that scheduling

23
24
25
26 ¹ The tenor of the response to the order to show cause is that violations of scheduling orders
27 are not important enough to warrant the imposition of monetary sanctions, *see* Docket No. 35 at
28 2, 5-7, which is flat wrong, *see, e.g.*, *Martin Family Tr. v. Heco/Nostalgia Enterps. Co.*, 186 F.R.D.
601, 602-04 (E.D. Cal. 1999) (explaining importance of scheduling orders, disabusing counsel of
the misperception that compliance with scheduling orders is “optional,” and imposing monetary
sanction for failing to file a status report by ordered deadline).

1 orders are not “hard and fast” so long as counsel finish discovery “within the spirit of the discovery
 2 order time frame”).²

3 Given the circumstances, the Court declines to impose monetary sanctions, though it would
 4 be within its discretion to do so. Instead, counsel must read in its entirety the decision issued in
 5 *Martin Family Trust*, 186 F.R.D. 601, and must file a certification attesting to having done so by
 6 December 8, 2023. Counsel are also **CAUTIONED** that they must heed Rule 29(b) moving
 7 forward. The order to show cause is otherwise **DISCHARGED**.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: December 1, 2023

10 
 11 Nancy J. Koppe
 12 United States Magistrate Judge

13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23

24 ² Counsel now also explain that “[t]aking a deposition two days after the deadline [to
 25 complete discovery] does not undermine the court’s ability to control its docket.” Docket No. 35
 26 at 7. That assertion does not address the supplemental written discovery that was apparently due
 27 earlier, but not provided. Docket No. 35 at 4. Moreover, and significantly, counsel attested just a
 28 few weeks ago that the case management scheduled needed to be modified precisely because the
parties were engaging in discovery after the discovery cutoff. Docket No. 32 at 2.

29 Counsel also argue that good cause existed to extend the discovery cutoff, Docket No. 35
 30 at 6-7, but the obvious problem with that excuse is that counsel did not file a request with the Court
 31 seeking relief from that deadline and, instead, simply granted themselves relief.